

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Volume IV, No. 8

May 15, 1944

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

European Christianity in the Post-War World

A CURRENT announcement in the press states: "Government officials, leading psychiatrists, mental hygienists and anthropologists will hold a two-day meeting in New York late next month on the question 'What To Do With Post-War Germany?'"

"It is understood that the findings of this closed conference will go to the State Department."

It may not be irrelevant to point out that when Nazism arose, the people who failed to oppose it in Germany were government officials, psychiatrists, hygienists, anthropologists and other educators; whereas what little effective resistance there was, came mainly from the churches. It is also interesting to observe that governmental agencies, our own included, have been continually supplying to the general public news of the way in which the churches constitute the spiritual center of resistance in Germany and the occupied areas. It is relevant to remember such a statement as that made not long ago by Miss Barbara Ward, brilliant editor of the *London Economist*, writing in the *Christian News-Letter*. She says: "Europe is like a country over which a tornado has passed. It has torn up all the landmarks and institutions and destroyed universities and schools. Practically speaking, the only institutions which remain as a continuous link with Europe's past are the Christian churches—the pulpits from which the German pastoral was read; from which Bishop Berggrav was able to read out his defiance of Quisling. In a Europe from which all institutions have been wiped out there still exists a great network of organized bodies who speak with the voice of Europe and who still recognize these loyalties to freedom for which we say we are fighting."

In the light of all this we ask: Is it presumptuous to assume that a serious-minded group of persons concerned for the answer to the question as to how post-war Germany should be treated, might be expected to consult those who know the story of the Church in Germany, as well as those who are particularly acquainted with educational, government and general cultural matters?

The fact is of course that people in the United States, even very intelligent people, many inside the

churches, still do not understand what is meant by the statement that the situation in Germany represents a crisis in faith and that the reconstruction which is to come, if it is to be real reconstruction with any chance of permanence, will take its character in no small part from consideration of inner motivation and conviction.

For those who know how to read the signs of the times the evidences multiply that such vital and dynamic forces in the church life of Germany and the occupied areas have increased rather than diminished under persecution. Certainly many persons hitherto indifferent to the Church have been attracted to it by the sheer drama of the courageous resistance made by church leaders, both Catholic and Protestant. This would seem to show that any realistic facing of the question of Germany's future must take into account the potential influence of church forces, particularly those forces which have been consistently anti-Nazi throughout the period of the last decade.

The difficulty is that America in general is so given to thinking along purely secular lines that government officials regard the Church as simply a place of preaching, for baptisms, weddings and funerals. To this extent, its concept of religious freedom is not unlike that of the Nazis and the Communists, although with a very different presupposition. In Holland, as the paper *Free Netherlands* has pointed out, many persons have discovered the Church is the conscience of the nation. This is certainly what it ought to be; but this is not recognized, so far as America is concerned. Archbishop of Canterbury has protested in Britain, i.e., the exclusion of the Church from public life and the persistent assumption that religion is exclusively personal. This protest would be even more applicable to our situation. Individual government plans for post-war work in devastated lands usually assume that anything the churches do is "supplemental."

Obviously, however, on any view of institutional religion, if the confessional churchmen of Germany can be said to represent, as one believes they do, the best Christian conscience of Germany, it is certainly good sense to include them in our thinking about post-war German arrangements. If they are not

included, it is safe to predict that any plans made will prove abortive.

Christians, therefore, who care about the structure of the post-war world, would do well to bring home to government officials the importance of such considerations as are here taken into account. Chances of success are scant enough without darkening them further by omitting the most important spiritual and moral resources produced by the years of tragic suffering in the land of Martin Luther. The men who in contemporary terms have been able to say: "Here we stand, God help us. We can do no other," are the people who must furnish some of the resources of a peaceful and cooperative social and political order. H.S.L.

Editorial Notes

The Mayor of New York has contributed to racial injustice by expressing alarm over the few thousand Japanese-Americans who have come to New York City. The particular occasion for his statement was neighborhood opposition to a hostel for Japanese-Americans in a section of New York, sponsored by church authorities. This incident, following upon the eviction of six Japanese-Americans from a New Jersey community, because the farmers of the countryside objected to their presence, gives a dismal picture of our democracy. It proves how widespread the mania of race prejudice is. Negro-white relations are precarious enough; but Negroes do at least have voting power in many of the larger centers of the North, which gives them some opportunity to effect political policy. Incidentally, when a man like LaGuardia, who has consistently championed the rights of Negroes, joins the obscurantists in his treatment of the Japanese, one begins to suspect that he is more the politician and less the Christian than one had previously supposed. The Japanese-Americans do not have enough votes to impress any politician. It will be the more necessary therefore for the religious forces of the country to champion their cause.

Several denominations have protested the decision of the Selective Service authorities, which cancels the exemption from the draft of pre-theological students and thereby practically dries up the flow of students to our theological seminaries after this year. They are right of course in pointing out that this policy will finally imperil the Church, which has already drained its "manpower" resources in sending men into the chaplaincy. On the other hand it is a question whether the Church ought not, at least, be

more circumspect in making this claim upon the community. One is that denominational anarchy of Protestantism leads to profligate duplication of resources in thousands of communities. It might be a very good thing for the churches to be forced by the exigencies of the hour to consolidate their churches in many communities in which the multiplication of churches is an affront. The other reason why this plea ought to be made with more hesitancy is that it places an almost intolerable burden upon eighteen-year-olds, who are presumed to have reached fixed vocational commitments at an age when they usually had not made them before the war. Most of our recruits for the ministry came to a decision in college, and not before, in previous years. Now they are asked to make such a decision, when it has become the only decision which will relieve them of the draft. Such a decision, under such a pressure, should not be placed upon the conscience of eighteen-year-olds. It might be better to suffer a shortage in the ministry for several years.

We have received a suggestion from a chaplain that the churches of the nation ought seriously to consider whether or not chaplains could be brought under some kind of unofficial or semi-official organization, such as the Red Cross, in the future. The suggestion is prompted by the fact that the present official status of the chaplain in the army and the navy, identifies him too completely with the military establishment, subjects him too much to the caprice of the commanding officer, who may or may not be sympathetic to the work of the chaplain, and places the barrier between the chaplain and the men which always exists between commissioned officers and the ranks.

Years ago a similar suggestion emanated from church circles who were primarily interested in separating the Church from the "war system." The idea at that time did not receive any general support, because it was justified by reasons which did not commend themselves to the mind of the Church. The idea is nevertheless worth considering; for it has become quite obvious that it is not easy to preserve the complete freedom of the Gospel when the Christian testimony must be borne under the restrictions which official status places upon the preacher. It must be remembered however that only a Church, much more united than Protestantism now is, could possibly succeed in making such arrangements. If the Church were sufficiently united to accomplish this end, it might also be able to give its chaplains the kind of support, which would give them a greater dignity and independent status inside the military establishment.

A Program for a Democratic Germany

The following program for a democratic Germany has been developed by a group of German leaders now in this country representing all former anti-Nazi and anti-Nationalist political parties of Germany and every shade of democratic opinion. We are presenting this statement to our readers because we believe that the program has intrinsic worth and that it has additional significance because it represents a remarkable agreement among leaders of German thought now in this country.

ONLY through cooperation between the Western powers and Russia will it be possible to achieve the reconstruction of Europe which must follow the necessary and certain defeat of Hitler Germany. This has been borne out clearly by the military and political course of the war. Any kind of unilateral settlement in Europe imposed by the East or the West would lay the foundations of new world-wide conflicts. With this view in common, a number of persons belonging to various professions, groups and affiliations have united to make known their stand on the question of the future of Germany within the framework of a solution of the European problem. All of the signers are natives of Germany and have fought against Nazism from the beginning. For all their experience in non-German countries, whether or not they have become citizens, has shown them new and broader horizons of political thinking.

We cannot claim to have a formal mandate from people now inside Germany. We believe, however, that we typify some of the forces and tendencies which will be vitally needed in the creation of a new Germany within the framework of a free world. We therefore feel that it is our duty in the interest of the United States and the United Nations to express our conviction about the future of Germany at a time when the German people cannot speak for themselves. We do this in full independence and according to the democratic practice of the United States.

I

The solution of the German problem is a part of the solution of the European problem. The just claims of all the nations of Europe for reconstruction and for security must be met. In reorganizing Europe and in solving the German problem, conditions must be created which will forestall a third world war. It is inevitable that the German people will have to bear the consequences of the war into which Hitler has driven them. It is, however, self-evident that a lasting solution of the European question is only possible if there is a creative solution of the German question.

The prerequisite for any such solution is the defeat

of Nazism, the destruction of those who brought Nazism to power and the obliteration of its spirit in Germany and throughout the world. This will be accomplished in the battle for the liberation of Europe, by the coming liquidation of the Nazis, by the Germans themselves, and in the prosecution of the war-criminals. But in addition, those groups which were the bulwarks of German imperialism and which were responsible for the delivery of power into the hands of the Nazis must be deprived of their political, social and economic power. This applies particularly to the large landholders, the big industrialists, and the military caste whose political concepts and influence have had repeatedly a disastrous effect on German history. If, therefore, the German people will decide to dissolve large landholdings, to control heavy industry, to eliminate militarism and to remove those civil servants, judges and teachers beholden to these groups, they ought not to be impeded from the outside.

A disarmed Germany, together with the rest of the nations of Europe, must be fitted into the framework of a system of international security. It is taken for granted that Germany must return all conquered territory and that she must make good the damages she has caused to the limit of her ability. But it must not be forgotten that the first victims of National-Socialism were large numbers of Germans who dared to oppose Hitler. The majority of the Germans did not want war. The opposition of Germans against Hitlerism is now forcing the Nazis even more to augment their terror-organization and to maintain strong military units of occupation inside Germany. Policies leading to an enslavement of the German people and their pauperization must therefore be regarded as unwise and unjust. It should, furthermore, not be overlooked that to abandon the principles of the Atlantic Charter in one decisive case, means to abandon them in general.

It would be disastrous for the future of Europe if Germany were to be dismembered and split up economically and politically. This would create fertile soil for new pan-Germanist movements. It would prevent Germany from assuming responsibilities for the moulding of her future and shift this heavy burden to other nations. It would create an irredentism which might well become the greatest such movement of all times. Useful energies of the victorious nations would be consumed in the permanent task of suppressing this irredenta.

II

It is essential for the economic future of Europe and the world that Germany's productive power be conserved. If it were destroyed, the economic conditions would become hopelessly depressed in all coun-

tries of Europe, and trade between Europe and other continents would be reduced largely. Moreover, millions of Germans would become permanently unemployed and condemned to an involuntary parasitic existence. Thus a constant source of unrest would arise in the very center of Europe.

Germany's productive strength should be integrated in an international system of production and consumption. Such a system would make possible the economic cooperation of the European peoples and would lessen the significance of political boundaries. Only in this way can Germany fulfill her obligations and make material reparations on a large scale, and only thus can Germany, with the rest of Europe, be protected against the threat of economic chaos. Germany's economic hegemony and the danger of a rearming of Germany would be eliminated.

III

If Germany is to develop a democracy, it is necessary that the military and civil representatives of the United Nations give political leeway from the beginning to those who might best be able to create a new democracy. Moreover, it is necessary that all who shared in the responsibility for the rise of Nazism, should be excluded, even if it would be expedient to deal with them. On the other hand, all those must be considered who resisted Nazism, for instance the presently nameless men and women now in the Gestapo prisons and the concentration camps, trade unionists and workers of the labor movement, those who resisted in the churches and in the intellectual circles, in the middle class, in the cities and in the country, and other qualified individuals. The German democracy of the future will depend on all those people. With their help, preparations must be made for the inauguration of an independent German government. Guarantees for the establishment of the basic civil rights and liberties of the people must be given without delay. Racial laws must be abolished immediately. Religious and intellectual liberties must be restored. Freedom of the press, of assembly and of organization must be reestablished. No obstacles should be placed in the way of the rebuilding of a labor movement. The institutions set up by the Nazis must be removed. Social and democratic institutions which the Nazis abolished must be recreated.

An attempt of the German people to stamp out Nazism root and branch through a mass movement, and to prepare the ground for democracy should be welcomed by the United Nations; and should not be prevented or impeded under any circumstances. Only if the German people free themselves from National-Socialism through such an act of their own, will they be entirely free. The victory of the United Nations will break the external hold of Nazis over the German people. But only the German people

can free themselves spiritually. For this reason the German people should be given a peace which is constructive and gives them hope for the future, in spite of all burdens it must impose. Only this will enable Germany to develop and maintain a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

IV

The education of the German people in democracy must spring from their own historical experience. There are signs that such a development is already under way. They are to be found in the older generation which was never entirely taken in by Nazism. They are to be found even among those who have been educated under the Nazi system. They are found to a lesser degree in the generation that brought Nazism to power and which is now bled white on the field of battle. Even in this generation, however, resistance is not lacking.

In connection with this education of the German people through the historical events, German youth must be educated by German democrats who have grasped the meaning of these events. Education by foreigners is psychologically impossible. It is, however, desirable to reestablish quickly and on a large scale cultural and scientific exchange between Germany and other countries. Facilities essential to intellectual life, such as universities, schools, textbooks, public libraries, theaters, movies, must be freed of all taints of Nazism. The German people must again be given the freedom to express and to develop their spiritual and cultural forces.

It must be emphasized most vigorously that no education is worthwhile whose principles are belied by the social conditions. Education for democracy without an attempt to actuate democracy will only create resistance and cynicism. The prerequisite for any successful education of the German people, and especially of the German youth to democracy and international cooperation, is a society which guarantees to all groups social security and the opportunity to lead a purposeful life.

The undersigned are convinced that it is impossible to base the reconstruction of Europe on the enslavement of the German people. A new democratic Germany must be protected against the forces of reaction within and without. This need will be urgent from the moment hostilities cease. German democracy, permanently secured, will prove to be Germany's main contribution to the peace of Europe and the world.

A partial list of the signers of the declaration is: Provisional Chairman: *Dr. Paul Tillich*, Union Theological Seminary; *Siegfried Aufhaeuser*, former chairman German Trade Union of White Collar Workers; *Dr. Horst W. Baerensprung*, former County Governor and Police President, Magdeburg; *Professor Friedrich Baerwald*, Fordham University; *Elizabeth Bergner*, actress; *Dr. Felix Boenheim*,

chairman German-American Emergency Conference; *Bertolt Brecht*, writer; *Dr. Hermann Budzislowski*, former editor "Die Welt-Buehne"; *George Dietrich*, former member of the Reichstag;

Rev. Frederick J. Forell, pastor Second Presbyterian Church, New York; *Dr. Kurt Glaser*, former chairman Board of Alderman, Chemnitz, Germany; *Albert Grzesinski*, former Minister of State and of the Interior, Prussia; *Paul Hagen*, Research Director, American Friends of German Freedom; *Hans von Hentig*, University of Colorado; *Dr. Paul Hertz*, former secretary Social Democratic group in the Reichstag; *Oskar Homolka*, actor; *Marie Juchacz*, former member Reichstag, chairman of Labor Welfare Association; *Dr. Joseph Kaskel*, representative in the United States of the "Deutsche Blaetter";

Professor Julius Lips, anthropologist; *Peter Lorre*, actor; *Heinrich Mann*, writer; *Professor Alfons Nehring*, Fordham University; *Dr. Otto Pfeifferberger*, lawyer; *Erwin Piscator*, New School for Social Research; *Professor Friederich Pollock*, International Institute of Social Research, Columbia University; *Veit Valentin*, writer; *Otto Zoff*, writer; *Carl Zuckmayer*, writer.

This statement has the support of a group of American citizens who have presented it to the American public with the following supporting statement:

We the undersigned wish to bring to the attention of our fellow citizens the attached declaration of the newly-formed Council for a Democratic Germany.

The Council for a Democratic Germany is composed of former Germans, opponents of Nazism now in this country, and it is representative of the major anti-Hitler political trends. Their unity in defining common objectives for a democratic Germany represents a significant and encouraging development.

We believe this declaration to be highly important because it will help to crystallize democratic opinion in Germany and to create unity among the anti-Nazi forces. It shows the way in which a democratic solution of the German problem would support a general democratic solution of the whole European problem. On the other hand it also reveals that without a basic agreement between Russia and the Western powers no solution either for Germany or for Europe is possible.

We believe that the value of this declaration lies not only in mobilizing anti-Nazis inside Germany, but that it has an important bearing on political developments in this country as well. Without a genuine agreement between the great powers and without creative plans for the reorganization of all Europe, no peace will endure, no matter what steps are taken to destroy Germany's potential power for aggression. In the framework of a general European and world settlement it is possible, however, to allow the democratic forces of Germany to emerge, to

establish themselves and to relate themselves to the democratic forces of the world.

Since the temptation increases to look for purely repressive solutions of the problem of Europe, we believe that this statement of German democrats will strengthen the hands of those who seek a creative solution of our total problem.

Neither a "soft peace" nor a "hard peace," neither sentimentality nor vindictiveness, will create the conditions for an abiding peace. The conditions for such a peace are a basic agreement between the great powers, and a new organization of Europe in which all nations can find health and security. Then, Germany's power of destructiveness will be overcome, primarily by the reconstruction of her own political and economic life through revolutionary forces; and secondarily by fitting her life into the framework, and subjecting it to the discipline of a larger order.

William Agar, Dr. Henry Atkinson, Roger N. Baldwin, Professor John Coleman Bennett, Henry Seidel Canby, Dr. Walter B. Cannon, George S. Counts, Norman Cousins, Professor C. M. Destler, Professor John Dewey, Professor Henry P. Van Dusen, Frederick Eliot, William Emerson, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Professor Henry Pratt Fairchild, Lewis Gannett, Dean Christian Gauss, President Frank Porter Graham, Professor Walter Phelps Hall, Mortimer Hays, Robert Heckert, Right Reverend Henry W. Hobson, Sidney Hollander, Ben W. Huebsch, Alvin Johnson, Rufus M. Jones,

Harris M. Kallen, Paul Kellogg, Alfred G. Baker Lewis, Louis P. Lochner, James Loeb, Jr., Professor Robert M. MacIver, Hiram Motherwell, William Allan Neilson, Reinhold Niebuhr, Right Reverend Edward L. Parsons, Judge Ferdinand Pecora, Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, Trude W. Pratt, Florence Reizenstein, Emil Rieve, Dean Howard Chandler Robbins, Cesar Saerchinger, Right Reverend William Scarlett, William Jay Schieffelin, Guy Emery Sipler, George Soule, Dorothy Thompson, Carl Hermann Voss, J. Ray Walsh, James A. Wechsler, Professor Walter F. Willcox, Howard Y. Williams, Rabbi Jonah B. Wise, Mary Woolley, David F. Seiferheld, Dr. Hanna Hafkesbrink.

At the suggestion of Bishop Henry B. Hobson the forward movement of the Episcopal Church through its Army and Navy Commission has provided CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS with funds to send our journal to all Episcopal chaplains. This now brings the number of chaplains on our list to 1,000. We are receiving letters every day from chaplains testifying to the helpfulness of the journal in their work.

The chaplains' fund is still open for further contributions.

The World Church: News and Notes

Statement on Religious Liberty

Hundreds of churchmen have signed an appeal to the President of the United States, sponsored by the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, asking for a more immediate implementation of the Moscow Declaration and through an organization of the United Nations. The text of the appeal is as follows:

We recognize the dignity of the human person as the image of God. We therefore urge that the civic rights which derive from that dignity be set forth in the agreements into which our country may enter looking toward the promotion of world order, and be vindicated in treaty arrangements and in the functions and responsibilities assigned to international organizations. States should assure their citizens freedom from compulsion and discrimination in matters of religion. This and the other rights which inhere in man's dignity must be adequately guarded; for when they are impaired, all liberty is jeopardized. More specifically, we urge that:

The right of individuals everywhere to religious liberty shall be recognized and, subject only to the maintenance of public order and security, shall be guaranteed against legal provisions and administrative acts which would impose political, economic, or social disabilities on grounds of religion.

Religious liberty shall be interpreted to include freedom to worship according to conscience and to bring up children in the faith of their parents; freedom for the individual to change his religion; freedom to preach, educate, publish, and carry on missionary activities; and freedom to organize with others, and to acquire and hold property, for these purposes.

To safeguard public order and to promote the well-being of the community, both the state, in providing for religious liberty, and the people, in exercising the rights thus recognized, must fulfil reciprocal obligations. The state must guard all groups, both minority and majority, against legal disabilities on account of religious belief; the people must exercise their rights with a sense of responsibility and with charitable consideration for the rights of others.

The appeal was signed by 1,251 religious leaders.

Meeting of Russian Orthodox Bishops at Vienna

Pravoslavmaya Russ, the Russian Orthodox periodical appearing in Slovakia, published on November 12, 1943 a full account of the meeting of Orthodox Russian Bishops held at Vienna at the beginning of October.

Those who attended this meeting included the Metropolitan Anastasy of Karlovci, Seraphim of Paris, Seraphim of Berlin, Benedict of Grodno, and the Bishops of Prague, Vienna, Potsdam, and Gomel (the last named being consecrated during the meeting), together with other members of the clergy and laity having the right to vote. It is, on the other hand, noteworthy that

a number of Russian Orthodox Church dignitaries in occupied Europe abstained from attending the meeting, notably Metropolitan Eulogius, resident at Paris.

The Vienna meeting heard several reports on the situation of the Church. Metropolitan Benedict, who was in the diocese of Grodno at the time of the entry of the Soviet Army in 1940, reported that the Jirovitsk monastery was used to quarter troops, and went on: "On the very day of their arrival, the soldiers wanted to see the church. They entered in great numbers. Most of them uncovered; some made the sign of the cross. Others, however, did not take off their helmets. I went up to them and said: 'According to our Orthodox tradition, one must not enter a church with one's head covered. This custom is respected even by those who do not share our faith. For that reason I ask you to uncover or else to leave the church.' The majority uncovered; only a small number went out.

"After the military forces came the civilian authorities, who subjected the monks to a close interrogation, after which they arrested and deported to the east all those who had directly or indirectly made common cause with the White Russian movement twenty years ago. The monastery was deprived of most of its landed property, and subjected to taxes corresponding to one third of its revenue. Processions were forbidden and some other restrictions imposed, but the monastery was not shut."

Going on to Moscow, Mgr. Benedict was consecrated bishop by Metropolitan Sergius. "Metropolitan Sergius," he said, "was living where he has always lived, in a properly furnished house. The Soviet authorities put a motor-car at his disposal, and in general have granted him decent conditions of life. He walks with difficulty and is hard of hearing, but his mind is absolutely clear.

"The Church of Bogoyavlinsk serves him as cathedral. About thirty other churches in Moscow are open for worship. Besides Metropolitan Sergius, the Synod is composed of six archbishops. Twenty-two prelates in other parts of the country, and about 1,000 priests, are under the Metropolitan. Administrative relations with these other prelates are, however, irregular, so that most of the dioceses are governed in an almost independent way. . . . In the provinces, the authorities generally act in a more arbitrary way than they do at Moscow. Thus several archbishops have not been able to maintain contacts with the capital, even in writing."

Archpriest Gavrilkov of Ukraine declared that the autocephalous movement in Ukraine was steadily decreasing in importance. Consequently the life of the Russian Orthodox Church was being more solidly established. However, "owing to the modifications of the front line, nearly all the bishops and many of the members of the clergy have been evacuated from the regions occupied by the Bolsheviks. Most of them have found a refuge in Slovakia, at the monastery of St. Job of Potchaiev, where there are at present Archbishop

Pantelemon of Kiev, Archbishop Antony, the Bishop of Poltava and Melitopol. The fate of the Archbishop of Tchernigov, who had not time to be evacuated, is unknown."

I.C.P.I.S. Geneva.

Theological Situation in the Czechoslovak Church

The Czechoslovak Church, which separated from the Roman Catholic Church after the last war and adopted a rationalistic theological outlook, has recently been carrying out a great deal of theological study. New Testament theology is the favorite subject of the new generation of theologians issuing from the John Huss Faculty at Prague. Systematic theology has been enriched by a new work on the theology of the Czechoslovak Church by A. Spisar. The questions of the liturgy and constitution of the Church are being much discussed.

I.C.P.I.S. Geneva.

A German Chaplain's Confession

A journal in Russia for the German prisoners recently published a statement by a German army chaplain in which the spiritual situation among German troops is described as follows:

"We thought that now [with the beginning of the war] the government inspired campaign against the churches would cease. But immediately a word from Himmler changed the impression. Himmler wrote: 'Simultaneously with the external struggle against the red international of the East and the golden international of the West, we must carry on the spiritual campaign against the black international in our own midst.'

"'Chaplain,' declared the captain of our regiment, 'you will have to deal with Private Z. He is conducting subversive activity in the army.' What had the private, who was a leader in the Catholic youth movement, done? He had said to his corporal: 'You can hardly blame me if I have no enthusiasm for this war. If we win the war the government will rob me of my holiest possession, my religion. If we lose the war, the enemy will destroy our very existence. But I will do my duty, as well as anyone.'"

The chaplain continues by describing his impressions of the Russian campaign. How they expected to find in the Balkans and in Russia itself, people who were "waiting for their emancipation." Instead they found resolute soldiers, fully equipped, and ready to fight "as only men fight who love their liberty and their country." He records the depression of the men prompted by letters from home. One wife wrote to her soldier husband: "You probably do not know any more that you are married to me since you have not been home for two years. Do not be surprised if I 'go out' occasionally. One must do something for the sake of change."

The disappointment of the soldiers in not having any safe winter quarters is recorded. Every position held, must be resolutely maintained against constant attacks and frequently Russian advances must be thrown back at the price of heavy losses. In the first winter of the Russian campaign warm clothing for the soldiers did not arrive until February.

The chaplain then speaks of the slow awakening of the men in the prisoner's camp. "What we could not see as the conquerors of this great land, we now learn in prison camps. It is that love has clearer eyes than hatred. As prisoners," he continues, "we may conquer this nation spiritually in the sense that we are coming to terms with the new Russian man. In this battle of the soul we, as prisoners, are learning what it is to be free. Some day we will leave the mass graves of Stalingrad behind and begin our return to Germany. This return journey must end in a free Germany. We greet you our fatherland."

Catholics on Negro Education

Rev. Claude Heithaus, S.J., of St. Louis University, recently preached a sermon to the student body of the university in which he declared: "Some people say that if the Society of Jesus gives Catholic Negroes the Catholic education which the Church wishes them to have that white students will walk out. Is this true? I deny it. I say it is a lie and a libel. I challenge the whole world to prove that even one of our Catholic students will desert us when we apply the principles for which Jesus Christ suffered and died."

During the course of the sermon the entire student body repeated the following prayer with Father Heithaus: "Lord Jesus Christ, we are sorry and ashamed for all the wrongs which the white man has done to your colored children. We are firmly resolved never again to have any part in them and to do everything in our power to prevent them."

South India Reunion

The present position concerning the "South India Scheme" is as follows: The negotiating Churches (South India dioceses of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon which belongs to the Anglican communion, the South India districts of the Methodist Church and the South India United Church, the origins of which are Presbyterian, Congregationalist, and Methodist) have put the scheme in what they think must be its final form. They consider that the time for decision has come.

The Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, which is the Anglican body concerned, has written to the Metropolitans of all the churches of the Anglican communion asking whether "if the Scheme of Church Union in India, as proposed is consummated, this Province will (a) break off communion with the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, and/or (b) refuse to be in communion with the Church of South India."

In England, the archbishops have consulted their brother bishops and drafted a reply which would not hinder the scheme going forward. They have communicated this draft to the Houses of Clergy in Convocation saying that, while this is a matter for the bishops to decide and not one requiring the joint action of bishops and clergy, they do not wish to proceed without first taking the clergy into consultation. In the province of York, the clergy have given their assent to the proposed reply. In Canterbury they have appointed a committee to examine it and are going to

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
DOROTHY CLEMENS, <i>Editorial Assistant</i>	

have a special session in January for the purpose of expressing their opinion to the bishops.

Meanwhile, there has been a somewhat violent campaign against the scheme organized by the Anglo-Catholic section of the Church of England in which the members of the religious communities have taken a leading part. This may lead to the House of Clergy (Canterbury) being divided on the subject in January, but it is expected that the bishops' reply will go forward substantially as it has been drafted.

I.C.P.I.S. Geneva.

Communications:

Our editorial on "The Test for Domestic Policy" brought an interesting letter from a New York business man which contained the following: "I think the article most constructive and something that should be said to business people, only slightly readjusted as to where the leadership should be. Most of the business organizations with which I am connected are constantly talking about free enterprise, but do not come to terms with what it is or what success we can expect from it, if after the war we return to whatever it is immediately. A definition I just heard of free enterprise was 'freedom from the Ten Commandments.'"

Canon W. W. Judd of Toronto has sent us a statement made by the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada concerning free enterprise. This statement, which calls attention to the problem of organizing "human affairs in such fashion that both freedom and fellowship in a controlled economy may be secured to all," goes on to say:

"One major area in which this will have to be accomplished is in the right ordering of employment and leisure and in the relation between free enterprise on the one hand, and public control or direction and/or

ownership, and public works, on the other. These ought not to be regarded as antithetical. Rather will there have to be an integration of both, with, however, the latter reaching its position by progressive steps and with due regard for the present rights of all concerned. The Synod deprecates the statements so often made, some of them born of fear and others of selfishness, by those on the one hand who desire rigidly to adhere to the traditional principles of organized industry, and who have not been free from responsibility for the disasters of these days, and those, on the other hand, who, though rightly desiring a fairer share in control and emoluments of the resources of the earth and of their own labour, incite class suspicion and apparently deny the rights of others."

Sir:

"In regard to your March appeal for Protestant chaplains, I wish to express my amazement that up to now you and the other liberal religious press apparently have shown no concern with the unwillingness of the navy and army to accept men for the chaplaincy who have a liberal reputation.

"Surely this policy on the part of the services is widely known. When I use the term 'liberal,' I do not refer to theology, with which I suppose the services have no concern, so long as an applicant is approved by the advisory boards. I refer to the fact that men who opposed Nazism and fascism before America entered the war are unacceptable to the services. If a man was interested in the Loyalist cause in Spain, or if a man was associated with other radical and liberal movements, so that the red-baiters knew his name, the chaplaincy is not for him.

"In my judgment, and to the best of my recollection, not a single man has gone from this district of the - - - church into the chaplaincy who could be termed a social liberal, who had manifested any concern for social religion. On the other hand some of our finest men have been rejected. One who would have made a better chaplain than any other man I know, because of his fine talent for personal relations, and his deep brotherliness, was rejected by both army and navy because of his social views, after meeting physical tests and being recommended by the advisory board. A member of this board, stated that one of the services rejected a man because he belonged to a cooperative. This is probably an overstatement, but expresses his judgment about the social bias demanded of an applicant for the chaplaincy.

"I have refrained from applying because, in part, I know full well I would be rejected. I am a veteran in the fight against fascism; veterans are not wanted, only the starry-eyed boys who never knew there was a fascist menace until war was declared.

"Why don't you look into this matter, gather more facts than I am prepared to submit, having made no study of it, and temper your appeals at least with a few tears for the stupidity of the services who refuse to commission officers or accept chaplains who are veterans in the war against Hitler and Mussolini?"

DON M. CHASE,
Minister.

Public Library

Woodward & Kirby Aves.

Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-45